

## REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed February 15, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-50 were last presented for examination in this application. Claims 8-11, 14-16, 18-20, 23, 25-27, and 31-50 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-7, 12, 13, 17, 22, 24, and 28-30 are rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, independent claims 1 and 30 have been amended. Claim 21 has been canceled. Claim 51 has been added. No new matter has been added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1-20 and 22-51 will be pending in this application. Of these fifty (50) claims, seven (7) claims (claims 1, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37 and 40) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

### *Examiner Interview*

2. Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the telephonic interview conducted on June 14, 2007. In the Interview the Examiner confirmed that independent claim 1 was the generic claim elected by Applicants. The Examiner was not persuaded that claims 10 and 11 as shown in embodiments in Figures 18 and 19 should be included in the Species 1 elected by Applicants. Examiner agreed that Applicants may cancel claim 21 and add a new claim with the same language as contained in claim 21, which Applicants have done as new claim 51, below. The Examiner was also not persuaded that claim 9 as shown in an embodiment in Figure 20 should be included in the Species 1 elected by Applicants.

### *Art of Record*

3. Applicants acknowledge receipt of form PTO-892 listing additional references identified by the Examiner. Applicants acknowledge return of form PTO/SB08a filed by Applicants on March 28, 2005, which has been initialed by the Examiner indicating consideration of the references cited therein.

### *Election/Restriction*

4. The invention (Specie 1) has been elected for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 8-11 and 18-19 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention.

*Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

5. Claims 1, 3-7, 12, 22 and 29-30 are rejected as being anticipated by Caracciolo (US 3,271,625). Based on the claim amendment above and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

6. Applicants' invention as claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 30 recites non-sacrificial conductive components "comprising at least one electrically conductive elongate member... [and] coating at least a portion of the non-sacrificial component with an electrically insulating material such that each said at least one electrically conductive elongate member is contiguous and circumferentially covered by said electrically insulating material." (See, Applicants' amended claim 1, above.)

7. Caracciolo describes an electronic package assembly in which an electronic device 36 is placed inside of a housing which provides protection against thermal and mechanical shock. (See, Caracciolo, col. 1, ll. 17-18.) In Figure 3 of Caracciolo, a conductive electrode structure 11 comprising conductive metal strips 13 is shown sandwiched between two sheets 17 which are made of insulating / dielectric material. (See, Caracciolo, Fig. 3, col. 3, ll. 11-17.) After the two insulating sheets 17 are placed in a sandwich configuration, the entire sandwich assembly is fired in a manner (e.g., placing in a furnace) to form the same into a unitary body 31, such that conductive metal strips 13 of electrode structure 11 is embedded within insulating sheets 17 of body 31. (See, Caracciolo, Fig. 4, col. 3, ll. 25-35.) Afterwards, a recess 21 is created in body 31 having embedded metal strips 13 such that conductive metal strips 13 become exposed. (See, Caracciolo, Fig. 5, col. 3, ll. 46-50, 67-70.)

8. Subsequently, within recess 21, an etchant is used to attack a portion of the conductive metal strips 13 that is exposed within recess 21. Once side portions 14 of electrode structure 11 are cut away from metal strips 13, two sets of leads 24 are thereby created. (See, Caracciolo, Figs. 5-7, col. 4, ll. 3-19.) A miniature electronic device such as a semiconductor device 36 is then mounted in recess 21 of body 31, with the circuitry of semiconductor device 36 connected to the ends of leads 24 inside recess 21. (See, Caracciolo, Fig. 8, col. 4, ll. 57-60, 73-75.) Finally, a cover 32 is mounted on body 31 to complete the protective housing. (See, Caracciolo, Fig. 8, col. 4, ll. 40-45.)

9. Thus, Caracciolo neither teaches nor suggests Applicants' invention as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 30. Specifically, Caracciolo does not teach nor does it suggest a method in which "each said at least one electrically conductive elongate member is contiguous and circumferentially covered by said electrically insulating material." (See, Amended claim 1, above.) Unlike Applicants' independent claims 1 and 30, and as noted above, Caracciolo's metal strips 13 of electrode structure 11 are etched to form leads 24 that are not contiguous in the recess 21 portion. In Caracciolo, an electronic device such as semiconductor device 36 is mounted inside recess 21 in between and connected to the internal ends of leads 24. In fact, the goal of Caracciolo is to provide a protective housing for a semiconductor or other device that is connected to conductive leads which are embedded and protrude out of the protective housing, thus providing leads 24 which are not contiguous inside recess 21 once side portions 14 are removed. Unlike Caracciolo, Applicants' invention does not seek to provide a protective housing inside of an embodiment of Applicants' invention. Instead, as recited by Applicants' independent claim 1, Applicants' invention provides for elongate members that are "contiguous and circumferentially covered by said electrically insulating material." For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that independent claims 1 and 30 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Caracciolo or other art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 30 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Dependent claims***

10. Dependent claims 2, 17, 24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Caracciolo (U.S. 3,271,625). Dependent claim 13 is rejected as being unpatentable over Caracciolo (US 3,271,625) in view of Zadno-Azizi, et al. (US 5,907,893). Dependent claim 28 is rejected as being unpatentable over Caracciolo (US 3,271,625) in view of Coffy (US 5,462,408).

11. The dependent claims incorporate all the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are also allowable over the art of record.


*New claims*

12. By the foregoing amendments Applicants added new claim 51. New dependent claims 51 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. In addition, claim 51 recites steps neither taught nor suggested by Caracciolo taken alone or in combination with the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully asserts that new claim 51 is allowable over the art of record.

*Conclusion*

13. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request re-examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael G. Verga', is written over a horizontal line.

Michael G. Verga  
Registration Number 39,410  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1875 Eye Street  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 756-4357  
(202) 293-6229 (FAX)

June 15, 2007